

LupusProximo on ECDIS Training Risks

[LupusProximo](#)

[16h](#)

Can you analyse user LupusProximo input in the thread : ECDIS Type Specific Training

[IronMikeBot](#) Forum Helper

[16h](#)

► Thinking

In the thread titled “**ECDIS Type Specific Training**” (Topic ID: 75154), user **LupusProximo** provides a detailed, authoritative, and somewhat combative analysis of the requirements for ECDIS training. Their input focuses on the distinction between generic training, shipboard familiarization, and manufacturer-specific courses, heavily emphasizing safety, liability, and the practical realities of maritime operations.

Here is an analysis of LupusProximo’s contributions to the discussion:

1. Core Argument: The Necessity of Manufacturer Training

LupusProximo argues that while the **STCW Code** and **ISM Code** technically allow for shipboard familiarization (via a checklist) to satisfy “type-specific” requirements, relying solely on this is risky and often insufficient in practice.

- **Safety & Liability:** They emphasize that insurance companies and P&I clubs view a lack of formal manufacturer training as a potential cause for **unseaworthiness**. They cite legal precedents (e.g., *The “Happy Aras”*) where untrained crew led to vessel unseaworthiness claims.
- **Practicality:** They contend that a short onboard familiarization (often 1 hour during handover) is “minimalistic” and “absurd” compared to the 8-12 hours of structured training provided by manufacturers. They argue that filling out a checklist does not equate to the knowledge gained from a dedicated course.

2. Interpretation of Regulations

LupusProximo interprets the regulations as follows:

- **STCW & ISM:** They acknowledge that these codes require “familiarization” but argue that the *industry standard* (driven by P&I clubs and court rulings) has shifted toward requiring formal manufacturer certification to mitigate risk.
- **Auditor vs. Regulation:** They suggest that while an auditor’s demand for a manufacturer certificate might seem to contradict the literal text of STCW/ISM, the auditor is likely correct from a liability and industry-standard perspective. They advise the user to “err on the safe side” and attend the course.
- **Port State Control (PSC):** They warn that while some flags (like Australia/AMSA) may accept onboard familiarization, other PSC regimes (like MCA) are stricter and may demand manufacturer certificates.

3. Tone and Style

- **Authoritative & Direct:** LupusProximo speaks with the confidence of an experienced maritime professional (“Capt.” or similar implied status). They use strong language, stating that relying only on an SMS checklist is “absurd” and that “auditors are damn right.”
- **Confrontational:** The user is quick to challenge the original poster (saltedsea) for what they perceive as a lack of clarity or even dishonesty regarding the vessel’s status (public vs. commercial). They use phrases like “bullshit,” “arrogant boy,” and “disqualified as a serious interlocutor.”
- **Pragmatic:** Despite the confrontational tone, their advice is pragmatic: if in doubt, get the certificate. They argue that the cost of the course is negligible compared to the cost of a grounding or an unseaworthiness claim.

4. Specific Points of Contention with the Thread

- **The “Shipper” vs. “Shipowner” Distinction:** LupusProximo corrects saltedsea for using the term “shippers” instead of “shipowners” or “operators,” using this to question the original poster’s maritime knowledge and credibility.
- **Sovereign Immunity:** They engage in a debate regarding whether the vessel is a “sovereign immune” public vessel (exempt from PSC) or a commercial vessel. LupusProximo argues that even public vessels operating in international waters are subject to international standards and that the exemption doesn’t negate the need for proper training.
- **The “Deep Dive” Request:** When asked for specific regulatory text supporting their claim that manufacturer training is *mandatory* (rather than just

recommended), LupusProximo deflects, pointing to the “industry standards” of P&I clubs and the practical reality that auditors and PSC inspectors enforce these standards. They eventually ask the original poster to prove them wrong, though they remain firm in their stance.

5. Conclusion of LupusProximo's Stance

LupusProximo's final position is that **formal manufacturer type-specific training is the only way to truly ensure safety and compliance with industry expectations**, even if the strict letter of the STCW/ISM codes allows for onboard familiarization. They advise the user to:

1. Accept the auditor's requirement.
2. Understand that “familiarization checklists” are insufficient for modern safety standards.
3. Recognize that the “industry standard” (P&I clubs, insurers) dictates the actual requirement, not just the bare minimum of the convention text.

Summary: LupusProximo acts as a “reality check” in the thread, pushing back against a theoretical interpretation of regulations (saltedsea's view) with a practical, risk-averse perspective rooted in insurance, liability, and the realities of PSC inspections. Their input serves as a strong warning that while a company *might* get away with onboard familiarization, it is a significant risk that is not worth taking.